

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO
09/943,893	08/30/2001	Shinako Matsuyama	09792909-5132	2067
26263 7:	590 04/13/2004		EXAMINER	
	HEIN NATH & ROSEN	PAIK, STEVE S		
P.O. BOX 061080 WACKER DRIVE STATION, SEARS TOWER			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
CHICAGO, IL		OWER	2876	
•			D. TENAU ED 04/12/200	

DATE MAILED: 04/13/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		Application No.	Applicant(s)	-th
		09/943,893	MATSUYAMA ET AL.	v -
Office Action Summary		Examiner	Art Unit	
		Steven S. Paik	2876	
Doring of 6	The MAILING DATE of this communication app or Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence addres:	s
A SH THE - Exte afte - If th - If NO - Fail Any	MORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. Pensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 PRINTS (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. Provided the provision of the provision	36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be time within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONE	nely filed s will be considered timely. the mailing date of this commun D (35 U.S.C. § 133).	nication.
Status				
	Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>15 M</u> . This action is FINAL . 2b) This Since this application is in condition for allower closed in accordance with the practice under E	action is non-final. nce except for formal matters, pro		rits is
Disposit	ion of Claims			
5)□ 6)⊠ 7)□	Claim(s) 1-7,9-20 and 22-28 is/are pending in to 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw Claim(s) is/are allowed. Claim(s) 1-7,9-20 and 22-28 is/are rejected. Claim(s) is/are objected to. Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	vn from consideration.		
Applicat	ion Papers			
10)⊠	The specification is objected to by the Examiner The drawing(s) filed on 30 August 2001 is/are: Applicant may not request that any objection to the correction of Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction of the oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner The oath or declaration is objected to be objected to by the Examiner The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner The oath or declaration is objected to be objected to by the Examiner The oath or declaration is objected to be objected t	a)⊠ accepted or b)⊡ objected t drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See on is required if the drawing(s) is obj	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). ected to. See 37 CFR 1.1	
Priority (under 35 U.S.C. § 119			
12)⊠ a)	Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents 2. Certified copies of the priority documents 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority application from the International Bureau See the attached detailed Office action for a list of	have been received. have been received in Application ity documents have been received (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	on No ed in this National Stage	e
	,			
Attachmen		p		
2) 🔲 Notic 3) 🔲 Infori	e of References Cited (PTO-892) se of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) mation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) or No(s)/Mail Date	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal Pa 6) Other:	(PTO-413) te atent Application (PTO-152)	

Application/Control Number: 09/943,893 Page 2

Art Unit: 2876

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on March 04, 2004 has been entered.

Response to Amendment

2. Receipt is acknowledged of the Amendment filed March 15, 2004. The Amendment includes cancellation of claims 8 and 21 and changes to the claims 1-7, 9, 10, 13-20, 22, 23, and 25-28.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 4. Claims 1, 2, 4-7, 9-15, 17-20, 22-24, and 28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dulude et al. (USPN 6,310,966) in view of Ohtsuki et al. (USPN 5,831,547).

Re claims 1, 4-7, 9, 10, 14, 17-20, 22, 23, and 28, Dulude et al. disclose a person authentication system (Figs. 3-5, the Registration System 24, Transmitting section 40, and Receiving section 42) for executing personal authentication by comparing a template with sampling information, the template being person authentication data (biometric data 20 in Fig.

Art Unit: 2876

2), and the sampling information (col. 5, 11, 52-54) being input (44) by a user (first user) and a method for using the same. The system and method comprise a person authentication authority (Biometric Certificate Generator 32 in Registration Authority 34 of Fig. 2) for issuing an electronic person authentication certificate (biometric certificate 16) including the template (20), a person authentication execution entity (Biometric certificate extractor 64, second classifier 84 in Receiving section 42) for obtaining the certificate including the template from the electronic person authentication certificate (biometric certificate extractor accesses a corresponding biometric certificate 16 stored in the memory 66) issued by said person authentication authority (34) and executing person authentication on the basis of the obtained template (col. 6, 1l. 58-65). Furthermore, the electronic person authenticate certificate (16) issued by said electronic person authentication authority (Biometric Certificate Generator 32 in Registration Authority 34 of Fig. 2) stores usage restriction information (validity period; col. 2, 11. 8-9) which includes at least either a certificate expiration date or usage number limit and said electronic person authentication entity (Biometric certificate extractor 64, second classifier 84 in Receiving section 42) checks the validity of the person authentication certificate (16) on the basis of the certificate expiration date (Biometric certificate extractor 64 accesses biometric certificate 16 stored in the memory or database 66. The biometric certificate includes a data filed for validity period.) or the certificate usage number limit when the person authentication is executed on the basis of the electronic person authentication certificate (col. 2, Il. 5-17).

Dulude et al. are silent about amended limitations of a person authentication authority receiving a request for updating an issued electronic person authentication certificate from an entity that received the electronic person authentication certificate, making a second electronic

Art Unit: 2876

person authentication certificate in which an updated certificate expiration date or an updated certificate usage number limit is set according to the request, and then issuing the second electronic person authentication certificate.

Ohtsuki et al. disclose a processor 202 reading the expiration date and the present date from the time and date clock 206. The processor compares the expiration data to the present date. If the time remaining until the expiration date is smaller than a predetermined number, the processor provides a signal to notify the user of the card (col. 6, lines 12-22). It is further disclosed that the expiration data can be modified according to the user's preset data (col. 6, ll. 34-57). Ohtsuki et al. teach that the timer 207 is previously reset for a predetermined time period and the timer may be reset for a desired time period.

Therefore, it would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having of ordinary skill in the art to have added means for keeping the present time and comparing it to an expiration date, as taught by Ohtsuki et al., into the teachings of Dulude et al. for the purpose of informing the user of remaining time until the expiration date and allowing opportunity to modify the time sensitive information according to the needs of a user.

Re claim 2, Dulude et al. in view of Ohtsuki et al. disclose the person authentication system (Figs. 3-5, the Registration System 24, Transmitting section 40, and Receiving section 42) as recited in rejected claim 1 stated above, where said person authentication execution entity (Biometric certificate extractor 64, second classifier 84 in Receiving section 42) checks the validity of the electronic person authentication certificate (16) on the basis of the certificate expiration date or certificate usage number limit (validity period) in person authentication on the basis of the electronic person authentication certificate, and then executes the person

Art Unit: 2876

authentication by comparing the template (20), stored in the electronic person authentication certificate (16), with sampling information input (46; col. 5, Il. 52-54) by the user (first user) on the condition that the validity of the electronic person authentication certificate has been confirmed on the basis of the certificate expiration date or the certificate usage number limit (validity period). Since the biometric data is from indicia based on the physical characteristics of the individuals including, not limited to, generic composition, facial characteristics, etc. As times goes, the physical characteristics inherently change. Thus, it is necessary to limit a validity of such biometric data for the purpose of providing authentication process with close to a zero error rate.

Re claims 11 and 13, Dulude et al. in view of Ohtsuki et al. disclose the person authentication system (Figs. 3-5, the Registration System 24, Transmitting section 40, and Receiving section 42) as recited in rejected claim 1 stated above, wherein said person authentication authority and said person authentication executing entity execute mutual authentication, when data communication is performed therebetween, a data transmitter (48) puts a digital signature (22) on transmitted data, and a data receiver verifies the digital signature (col. 7, 11. 26-44).

Re claim 12, Dulude et al. in view of Ohtsuki et al. disclose the person authentication system (Figs. 3-5, the Registration System 24, Transmitting section 40, and Receiving section 42) as recited in rejected claim 1 stated above, wherein the template (20) is at least one of personal biotic information, personal non-biotic information, and a password, wherein the personal biotic information (first category) is selected fro at least one of the group consisting of fingerprint information, retina pattern information, iris pattern information, voice print

Art Unit: 2876

information (col. 4, ll. 26-32), and handwriting information (col. 2, ll. 54-60), and wherein the personal nonbiotic information (second category) is selected from at least one of the first group consisting of seal information, passport information, driver's license information, and card information (col. 2, ll. 61-67 and col. 3, ll. 1-2).

Re claim 15, Dulude et al. in view of Ohtsuki et al. disclose the person authentication method (Figs. 3-5, the Registration System 24, Transmitting section 40, and Receiving section 42) as recited in rejected claim 14 stated above, wherein the electronic person authentication execution entity (Biometric certificate extractor 64, second classifier 84 in Receiving section 42) checks the validity of the electronic person authentication certificate (16) on the basis of the certificate expiration date or certificate usage number limit (validity period) in person authentication on the basis of the electronic person authentication certificate, and then executes the person authentication by comparing the template (20), stored in the electronic person authentication certificate (16), with sampling information input (46; col. 5, 1l. 52-54) by the user (first user) on the condition that the validity of electronic the person authentication certificate has been confirmed on the basis of the certificate expiration date or the certificate usage number limit (validity period). Since the biometric data is from indicia based on the physical characteristics of the individuals including, not limited to, generic composition, facial characteristics, etc. As times goes, the physical characteristics inherently change. Thus, it is necessary to limit a validity of such biometric data for the purpose of providing authentication process with close to a zero error rate.

Re claim 24, Dulude et al. in view of Ohtsuki et al. disclose the person authentication method (Figs. 3-5, the Registration System 24, Transmitting section 40, and Receiving section

Art Unit: 2876

42) as recited in rejected claim 14 stated above, wherein said person authentication authority and said person authentication executing entity execute mutual authentication, when data communication is performed therebetween, a data transmitter (48) puts a digital signature (22) on transmitted data, and a data receiver verifies the digital signature (col. 7, 11. 26-44).

5. Claims 3, 16, and 25-27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dulude et al. (USPN 6,310,966) as modified by Ohtsuki et al. (USPN 5,831,547) as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Epstein (USPN 6,601,046).

Re claims 3, 16, and 25-27, Dulude et al. in view of Ohtsuki et al. disclose a person authentication system including all of the claimed features of the invention with the exception of storing a usage count in a memory of the person authentication executing device. Ohtsuki et al. disclose a modifiable predetermined time period.

Epstein discloses a system having a usage-limit function to protect the authenticity of copy-protected material, watermarking, ticketing, and the like. The system verifies the authenticity of the parameters and provides access to a copy-protected material only within the associated usage-limit of the material (Abstract). The usage-limit prevents the copy-protected material from being regenerated without a proper authentication process. Therefore, unauthorized usage of the copy-protected material is tightly controlled.

Thus, it would have been obvious to an artisan of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to further incorporate the teachings of verifying the expiry of usability of the copy-protected material, as taught by Epstein, in addition to the biometric authentication system of Dulude et al. and modified by Ohtsuki et al. due to the fact that an access to play the copy-protected material is more accurately and selectively given and the number of accessing the copy-

Art Unit: 2876

is limited to a predetermined number for the purpose controlling the number of access given to a particular material. Furthermore, such modification of employing the concept of limiting the usage of a copy-protected material, as taught by Epstein, to the teachings of Dulude et al. in view of Ohtsuki et al. would have been an obvious matter of design variation, well within the ordinary skill in the art, and therefore an obvious expedient.

Response to Arguments

6. Applicant's arguments filed March 15, 2004 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

The applicant argues that newly added limitations in the independent claims are not taught by Dulude et al. The new limitations are disclosed Dulude et al. in view of Ohtsuki et al. and Epstein.

On page 14 of the Amendment, the applicant stated that Ohtsuki merely states that the expiration date on the ticket can be compared to a predetermined time period, instead of comparing the expiration date to the present date. The examiner respectfully disagrees. Ohtsuki discloses numerously throughout the reference that the expiration date is compared to the present date obtained by the time and date clock 206. Ohtsuki further discloses that a user of the wireless card can reset the predetermined expiration time period for a desired time period.

In view of above discussion, claims 1-7, 9-20, and 22-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a).

Art Unit: 2876

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Steven S. Paik whose telephone number is 571-272-2404. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon - Fri (5:30am-2:00pm).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Michael G. Lee can be reached on 571-272-2398. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Steven S. Paik Examiner

Art Unit 2876